-1-

08cr0246 JM

At a minimum, during a deportation proceeding, the Immigration Judge ("IJ") must do the following three things: (1) inquire whether the person wants counsel; (2) determine a reasonable period of time for obtaining counsel; and (3) assess whether any waiver of counsel is knowing and voluntary. *Ram*, No. 05-71190, slip op. at 7575 (citing *Biwot v. Gonzales*, 403 F.3d 1094, 1100 (9th Cir. 2005). For a "waiver [of counsel] to be valid, an IJ must generally: (1) inquire *specifically* as to whether petitioner wishes to continue without a lawyer; and (2) receive a knowing and voluntary affirmative response." *Ram*, No. 05-71190, slip op. at 7575 (citing *Tawardrus*, 364 F.3d at 1103) (emphasis added).

Here, the IJ failed to meet even one of the three elements required to obtain a valid waiver of counsel. First, not once during Mr. Alvarez-Meza's deportation hearing did the IJ ask him whether he wanted counsel present or whether he needed more time to obtain counsel. Second, the IJ did not determine a reasonable period of time for Mr. Alvarez-Meza to obtain counsel. Finally, the IJ obtained no waiver of counsel whatsoever and thus, failed to assess whether a waiver of counsel was knowing and voluntary. The IJ did not *specifically* address Mr. Alvarez-Meza and ask him whether he wanted to speak with an attorney before the hearing or whether he wanted an attorney present during the deportation proceedings. Finally, the deportation tape is devoid of any waiver, intelligent or otherwise, from Mr. Alvarez-Meza, of his right to counsel. Therefore, Mr. Alvarez-Meza's due process rights were violated and his failure to exhaust his administrative remedies is excused.

A. Prejudice

Because the NTA did not allege any convictions at all, and because judicially noticeable documents do not show that he *was confined* to a penal institution for 180 days, Mr. Alvarez-Meza was wrongfully denied voluntary departure.

During Mr. Alvarez-Meza's deportation hearing, the IJ told him he may be able to obtain papers because there was evidence that his father was either a legal permanent resident or a United States citizen. At this point, the IJ should have inquired whether Mr. Alvarez-Meza wanted an attorney present or needed more time to obtain legal advice. Instead, the IJ told Mr. Alvarez-Meza that he had two options: (1) he could go back to the bond hearing and try to obtain a bond or (2) he could take a deportation. Mr. Alvarez-Meza was never personally told he had a right to obtain counsel and thus, was deprived of due process.

2
 3

4

5

6

7 8

10

9

12

11

13 14

1516

17

18

19

2021

23

22

24

2526

27

28

To establish prejudice, we do not have to show that relief actually would have been granted. Instead, we only need to show a "plausible" ground for relief from deportation. *Ubaldo-Figueroa*, 364 F.3d at 1048, 1050 (citing *United States v. Arrieta*, 224 F.3d 1076, 1079 (9th Cir. 2000).

Here, Mr. Alvarez-Meza had a plausible ground for relief in the form of voluntary departure. See 8 U.S.C. § 1254(e) (1996) (a person may receive voluntary departure if he is a person of good moral character for a period of five years preceding his application for voluntary departure); see also 8 U.S.C. 1101(f)(7) (a person may be one of good moral character if he does is not confined to a penal institution for an aggregate period of 180 days).

Had Mr. Alvarez-Meza been apprised of his right to counsel, counsel would have noticed the defect in the conviction documents and helped Mr. Alvarez-Meza obtain relief in the form of a voluntary departure or adjustment of status based on Mr. Alvarez-Meza's father's papers. Since the IJ did not afford Mr. Alvarez-Meza his right to counsel, Mr. Alvarez-Meza's alleged 1996 deportation is invalid. *See Ram*, No. 05-71190 at 7578 (an undocumented person "cannot appear pro se without a knowing and voluntary waiver of the right to counsel").

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Alvarez-Meza's prior alleged deportation in 1996 is invalid. Thus, the Court should dismiss the indictment.

Dated: July 1, 2008

s/Kurt David Hermansen

Attorney for Defendant Email: KDH@KurtDavidHermansen.com

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 08cr0246 JM
5	Plaintiff,
6	v.) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
7	MIGUEL ALVAREZ-MEZA,)
8	Defendant.
9	b elendant.
10	IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:
11	I, KURT DAVID HERMANSEN, am a citizen of the United States and am at leas
12	eighteen years of age. My business address is 110 West C Street, Suite 1810, San Diego
13	California 92101.
14	I have caused service of SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEPORTA
15	TION MOTION.
16	The following recipients are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case
17	and have thus been served electronically at the following email addresses:
18	Kurt David Hermansen KDH@KurtDavidHermansen.com
1920	Steven D. DeSalvo steven.desalvo@usdoj.gov, maria.richardson@usdoj.gov
21	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
22	
23	Executed on: July 1, 2008 s/Kurt David Hermansen
24	Attorney for Defendant KDH@KurtDavidHermansen.com
25	
26	
27	
28	

08cr0246 JM